



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

XI.—*On the Ethnological Position of the Guanches, as dependent on their Philological Relations.* By HYDE CLARKE, Fellow of the Ethnological Society, of the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries, Member of the German Oriental Society, of the American Oriental Society, of the Academy of Anatolia, of the Philological Society of Constantinople, etc.

[*Read March 10th, 1868.*]

THE remains we have of the languages of the Guanches are imperfect, but they are sufficient to show their affiliation with the races of North Africa. These remains consist of various words in the dialects of Lancerota, Canary, and Teneriffe, showing dialectic differences, which appear to be slight, after allowing for variations between transcribers. Unfortunately, these remains are particularly deficient in primary characteristic roots, which are most valuable for determination; but they include a considerable number of words of secondary class, indicative of culture or civilisation. The existing words have long since been identified as belonging to the North African or Atlantid languages, particularly to the Shiluh, as shown by Ritter. There are general and continuous affinities between all these languages, as the Berber, Tuaric, Shiluh, Showiah, and Siwah.

The chief characteristic root in Guanch is “water,” *ahemon*, repeated in the other languages as “aman,” in Coptic as “moon” or “man.” It is this Coptic word which connects it directly with the Semitic group. The relationship of the Guanch words for *barley*, *palm-tree*, *green fig*, *sticks*, *house*, *hog*, *mountain*, *valley*, and *sky*, is very close, particularly with Shiluh.

It does not necessarily follow from these facts that the Guanches, at the time of European discovery, were all of Atlantid race, or were of Atlantid race at all; but they do prove that there must have been an Atlantid dominion at a time anterior to the European, which may represent that of king Juba. It may be that the aborigines, anterior to this conquest, were of another race; but there must have been an extensive immigration of Atlantids, at all events sufficient to supersede any anterior language, though it may be the aboriginal blood survived. This consideration may suggest the cause of variations among the tribes, and even be the cause of those political disagreements

found among the natives on their rediscovery. At all events, the Canaries have been a seat of the Atlantids.

A question arises, What are these North African or Atlantid languages? The least examination by an unprejudiced person shows that their affinities are Semitic. The great Semitic scholars, nevertheless, reject the claim, and their opinions greatly influence ethnologists. M. Rénan does not include them in his great work on the *History of the Semitic Languages*, and, I know, does not intend to admit them. In my opinion there is no philological evidence for this rejection. M. Rénan and his colleagues affirm that the rejected languages have not the distinctive peculiarities of Semitic grammar. Were this true, it would be no sufficient reason in the presence of the conformity of roots; but, as has been shown by Mr. F. W. Newman and others, as to Berber, at all events, there is a great conformity with Semitic structure. The real reason is one not philological at all; which is, that it is very inconvenient for purposes of ethical and psychological theory to admit races which are inferior in civilisation to the high Semitic races, when these are claimed to be the authors of civilisation; or to admit even civilised races which are polytheistic, as monotheism is claimed as a distinguishing characteristic of the Semitists. Coptic is, therefore, excluded by them as a matter of necessity.

The conformity of roots has, likewise, been contested; but this has been from a want of sufficient regard for philological evidences, and Mr. Prichard is guilty of this. The first fact is the conformity of numbers; and I venture to assert, as a general law, that numbers present one of the best tests, after allowing for the influence of dominant races, as in the cases of the diffusion of Sanskrit numbers among now Indo-European inhabitants of India, and of Arab numbers in Africa. Such interpolations are always supplementary and not primary. The numbers in question exhibit as great a conformity as in that class with which we are best acquainted, the Indo-European, for their divergencies are not greater.

With regard to what are really primary roots, I am far from convinced that we have arrived at a satisfactory solution. The discovery of cavemen induces me to suggest a modification of our views on that head. It appears quite as likely that the parts of the body are taken from animals captured in chase, as from man; and if so, we may expect confusions as to arm and leg, hand and foot, such as we find. What would be primary articles of food enter into this consideration, and these would not be the articles of early Indo-European civilisation. Certain tools, suitable to cave and seashore life, would have

precedence over others, which have since obtained a greater use.

Looking, however, to the primary roots involved in this investigation, I do not find a greater divergence than in Indo-European, Malay, or any well-defined class of what is called Turanian. With regard to secondary roots, we must expect a divergence consequent on the various modes of culture and of geographical position. This remark is worthy of observation, that those best acquainted with the rejected languages, or with general philology, are those who most strongly maintain the relationship, and that this is rejected by those who are pure Semitic scholars.

In this contest the Semitists have, on the whole, had the preponderance; and the greatest stretch of boldness on the other side is to establish a sub-Semitic group. To me it appears that no opportunity should be lost in protesting against the erroneous scholarship which restricts the Semitic race to the northern members, and excludes the Copts and Atlantids; for a non-recognition of the due bounds of the Semitic race does great prejudice to ethnology and philology. With regard to the ethnological relationships, or diversities, between the members included in the group, they are not greater than in the Indo-European, Malay, Turkish, or African; and our inability to offer a right solution for these, is no sufficient ground at present to resist the classification. It is no more necessary to assert that Arabs, Copts, and Berbers are identical, than it is to assert that Hindoos and English are identical; and yet we have sufficient grounds to associate these, and divide them from other classes. By asserting the classification of the Semitic race in its several members, we get a better appreciation of its phenomena,—we recognise its African origin and northern and western extremities, and we ascertain the cradle of its historic civilisation. We find evidences of its having advanced westward to the Canaries,—of its efforts to dominate Central Africa, and of its attempts to extend itself to the north. To all of these efforts there were limits, notwithstanding powerful empires were established in Asia and on the Mediterranean.

While we are able to recognise the migrations into Asia, Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica, and Spain, we are still uncertain as to the earlier attempts on Europe. The endeavour to connect the Iberians with these African or Semitic races is futile. The Iberians must no longer be regarded simply as in connexion with Spain, but as I have already shown them, in Western Asia Minor, Greece, and Italy. There is no linguistic evidence in favour of the connexion; and the Iberians appear rather as a parallel race, resisting Semitic advance, until succumbing to

Indo-Europeans. The Ligurians have been suggested; but we must learn more of this remarkable people.

In referring to the subject of the northern migrations of the Africans, I beg to make a note on some comparisons of the Absné, a language of the Caucasus, with Fertit, Falasha, and Agaw of north-eastern Africa, languages of the Abyssinian region.

	ABSNÉ.	FERTIT.	
Man	katsha, kacha	koshi	ngardshi Agaw
Head	kah	kummu	
Eye	ullah	allah	ili Fastaha, Agaw.

There is not by any means sufficient here to work upon, and the bulk of the evidence is negative; but as the Absné constitutes an abnormal branch in the Caucasus, it may be useful to record this note.
